

REMARKS

Claims 1-34 are pending, and claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 10-13, 17, 21 and 25-30 have been amended. New claims 31-34 have been added. No new matter is presented in this Amendment.

At pages 2-8, item 2, of the Office Action, claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Young et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,727,060).

Independent claim 1 recites "A method of displaying a program progress time on a signal receiver . . . comprising . . . setting a command of the signal receiver which is commonly usable by a user as a display command to display time information about a currently viewed program." Thus, claim 1 recites setting a command of a signal receiver to display program progress time on the signal receiver.

In contrast, Young discloses displaying electronic program guide (EPG) information. As illustrated in Fig. 6 of Young, this information includes a program schedule with information such as program genre, program description, years of release, etc. Young, col. 8, ln. 46 to col. 9, ln. 10. However, the information displayed in the EPG does not include program progress time, as claimed in claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is requested.

Claims 2, 4-6 and 10-11 depend from claim 1 and are therefore likewise not anticipated by Young et al.

Claim 7 has been rewritten into independent form. Claim 7 recites "displaying next program information when the remaining program time reaches a preset time." Thus, the user sets a preset time, and at said preset time, the next program information is displayed.

Young et al. does not disclose this feature. Instead, the portion of Young et al. relied upon by the Examiner discloses a list 58 that alternates between a grid guide 24 and a What's Next on Channel row guide 58. Young et al., col. 9, ln. 66 to col. 10, ln. 11. This alternation is generated by toggling a user command. This method of viewing a program in the present differs from the current method, in which the user sets a future time at which the next program information will be automatically displayed.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 7 is requested.

Independent claim 12 recites "judging that the command for displaying the program progress time issued by the user so as to display the program progress time at a preset time set by the user prior to a program terminating time of the currently viewed program." Thus, the user presets a time for displaying the program progress time and the program progress time is displayed at this preset time.

Young et al. does not disclose this feature. Instead, the portion of Young et al., relied upon by the Examiner discloses changing the range of times within which program information will be displayed. For example, information is shown about programs broadcast between the current time and three hours later, column 24, lines 2-13. This period can be changed, for example, to a four hour time period. Thus, in Young et al., it is the display period that is changed. This differs from the present invention, in which the time at which the information is displayed is preset.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 12 is requested.

Independent claim 13 recites "determining the program progress time by subtracting the beginning time from a current time; displaying a display bar representing the total program broadcasting time; and displaying the display bar so as to indicate a position on the display bar corresponding to the program progress time." Thus, claim 13 recites a method of displaying a program progress time. As discussed above with respect to claim 1, this feature is not disclosed in Young et al., which relates to displaying EPG information. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 13 and claims 14-16 depending therefrom is requested.

Independent claim 17 recites that displaying is "in response to a command from a user to perform a function other than displaying the program progress time upon receipt of the command." Thus, the user issues a command to perform a function other than displaying the program progress time and program terminating information time, but this information is still displayed.

Young et. al does not disclose this feature. It appears that page 5 of the Office Action contains a typographical error, and that the Examiner is relying upon FIG 6 and col. 8, ln. 46-65 as disclosing this feature. This portion of Young et al. discloses displaying

information such as program genre and program description, which the Examiner construes as being the function other than displaying program progress time and termination time. Even assuming, *arguendo*, that the Examiner is correct in this regard, this portion of Young et. al does not disclose displaying program progress time and program terminating time.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 17 and claims 18-20, and 22-24 depending therefrom is requested.

Claim 21 has been amended to independent form, and recites "displaying next program information of a next program on a same channel as the currently viewed program at the preset time prior to the program termination of the currently viewed program." Thus, a time is preset by the user and the next program information is automatically displayed at the preset time.

Young et al. does not disclose this feature. Instead, Young et al. discloses that overlay 52 displays program information that may include a programming schedule for a future time. Young et al., col. 8, ln 46-65. This information is viewed by the user by using a SELECT command. Young et al. col. 9, ln. 1-11. This information is displayed at the time the user is issuing the display command. Young et al. makes no mention that the user may preset a future time at which the next program information will be displayed.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 21 is requested.

Independent claim 28 recites "a processor to produce data for displaying the program progress time in response to the command from the user." As discussed above, Young et al. does not disclose this feature. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 28 is requested.

Claim 29 has been rewritten into independent form, and recites "a processor to produce ON-Screen Graphic data for displaying the program progress time in response to the command from the user." As discussed above, Young et al. does not disclose this feature. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 29 is requested.

Claim 30 has been rewritten into independent form, and recites "said processor produces ON-Screen Graphic data for displaying next program information of a next program on a same channel as the TV program at a preset time prior to a program termination of the

TV program.” Thus, similar to a feature of claim 21, the user presets a time at which next program information is displayed. For the reasons discussed above, Young et al. does not disclose this feature. Instead, Young et al. discloses viewing future program information in the present time, but does not disclose presetting a future time at which this information will be displayed. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 30 is requested.

In the Office Action at pages 8-9, item 4, claims 8-9 and 25-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable by Young et al. in view of Jennings, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,542,088). This rejection is respectfully traversed in view of the following arguments.

Claims 8-9 depend from claim 1 and are therefore distinguishable from Young et al. for at least the above reasons.

Jennings Jr. et al. does not overcome this deficiency in Young et al. and is not relied upon by the Examiner as such. Instead, the Examiner relies upon Jennings Jr. et al. as disclosing a percentage calibrated time bar for indicating the percentage of the progressive program.

Even assuming, *arguendo*, that the Examiner’s assertion is correct, Jennings Jr. et al. still does not disclose displaying program terminating information about the currently viewed program as claimed in claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8-9 is requested.

Claim 25 depends from claim 17, which discloses displaying program progress time upon receipt of a command, and is therefore patentable over the combination of Young et al. and Jennings Jr. et al. for similar reasons.

Independent claims 26 and 27 both recite “displaying the program progress time of the currently viewed program in response to a command from a user to perform a function other than displaying the program progress time.” As discussed above with respect to claim 17, Young et al. does not disclose this feature. Instead, Young et al. discloses displaying information such as program genre and program description, which the Examiner construes as being the function other than displaying program progress time and termination time. Even assuming, *arguendo*, that the Examiner is correct in this regard, this portion of Young et al.

does not disclose displaying program progress time in response to a command other than displaying program progress time.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 26 and 27 is requested.

With respect to all claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103, it appears that the Examiner is using impermissible hindsight in this rejection. Contrary to the Examiner's position, Jennings Jr. et al. does not "disclose the same technique of displaying a status bar with its percentage numbers for indicating how many of the program is completed." Office Action, page 9. Jennings Jr. et al. does not relate to the television programs of the present invention, but instead relates to the performance of tasks in a computer system. Jennings Jr. et al., column 6, lines 20-30.

There is no suggestion in Young et al. to incorporate the percentage display of Jennings Jr. et al. into the environment of television programs. Merely asserting that doing this would satisfy the objective of a clearer visual notification of program time is not an adequate suggestion to modify the teachings in Young et al. Assuming *arguendo* that the objective of increased clarity would have been obvious, using the task display of Jennings Jr. et al. to accomplish this objective is not. By the Examiner's logic, any invention which increases accuracy and efficiency would have been obvious and, therefore, unpatentable. Applicant asserts that this is not what is intended to be the standard for evaluation of prior art under 35 U.S.C. §103.

New claims 31-34 recite above distinctions between the present invention and the cited references.

In view of the foregoing amendments, arguments and remarks, all claims are deemed to be allowable and this application is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Serial No.: 09/055,712

-16-

Docket No.: 1317.1028/MDS/MJB

If any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this Amendment,
please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP



Michael D. Stein
Registration No. 37,240

Date: 1/25/01
700 Eleventh Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001
Telephone: (202) 434-1500